

with the National Association of Secondary School Principals, constitute America's largest youth recognition program based exclusively on volunteer service. The award was created with the intent to impress upon all youth volunteers that their contributions are critically important and highly valued, and to inspire other young people to follow their example.

Erin should be extremely proud to have been singled out from such a large group of dedicated volunteers. I heartily applaud Erin for her initiative in seeking to make her community a better place to live, and for the positive impact she has had on the lives of others. She has demonstrated a level of commitment and accomplishment that is truly extraordinary in today's world, and deserves our sincere admiration and respect. Her actions show that young Americans can and do play important roles in our communities, and that America's community spirit continues to hold tremendous promise for the future. I call upon my colleagues to join me in applauding Erin for all that she has done.

SADDAM HUSSEIN

HON. MARCY KAPTUR

OF OHIO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, February 12, 2003

Ms. KAPTUR. Mr. Speaker, I submit the following article to be included in the RECORD:

[From The Halifax Daily News, Feb. 11, 2003]

THE WRONG QUESTION: IT'S NOT WHETHER SADDAM HAS CHEMICAL WEAPONS, IT'S WHETHER HE'LL USE THEM

(By Gwynne Dyer)

U.S. Secretary of State Colin Powell did a good job at the United Nations last week of laying out the evidence that Saddam Hussein has kept some of the chemical and biological weapons that he had before the Gulf War of 1990-91, and maybe even made more since then. If you doubted it before, you shouldn't doubt it any more. But it was the right answer to the wrong question.

Saddam should be forced to comply with his obligations and destroy all those weapons, but if you are planning to launch a war next month that will probably snuff out tens of thousands of lives, you have to answer a different question. Is there a big enough risk that Saddam will use those weapons himself in the near future, or give them to terrorists to use, to justify pulling the inspectors out and killing all those people now? No, there is not. Saddam Hussein has had these weapons for at least 20 years, and he hasn't given them to anyone in all that time. And why would terrorists need to get these weapons from Iraq anyway, when they could just steal their poison gas from the huge, poorly guarded stocks in Russia (secured, in some cases, with bicycle padlocks)—or mix them up in the kitchen sink like the Aum Shinrikyo cult did for its attacks on the Tokyo subway in 1995?

Besides, Saddam Hussein is no friend of al-Qaida. He is the kind of Arab leader the Islamists hate most: a secular, westernizing socialist who liberates women and makes deals with the West. Osama bin Laden says he is an "infidel" and has been calling for his overthrow for years.

Saddam is a thoroughly nasty dictator, but he is neither mad nor expansionist. In fact, if you were looking for a European parallel to Saddam Hussein's regime, it would be something like Nicolae Ceasescu's long reign in

Communist Romania—except that Ceasescu, safely contained within the Soviet bloc, never had a war with his neighbours.

Saddam Hussein, who is 66 this year, comes from the Arab generation that believed in modernization through revolutionary socialism on the Eastern European model. During the 1970s he behaved like a classic Communist leader, eliminating his rivals but taking the task of raising people's living standards quite seriously. With abundant oil revenues available, he built an Iraq where most people had decent jobs, the children were all in school, and women were freer than anywhere else in the Arab world. Then came the war with Iran, and everything went wrong.

Saddam always dreamed of becoming the hero-leader of the Arab world on the model of Egypt's Gamal Abdul Nasser, which is why he had a nuclear weapons program. (The first Arab leader to acquire a deterrent against Israel's nuclear monopoly automatically becomes an Arab hero.) He never showed any desire to conquer his neighbors, but Iraq did have territorial disputes with Iran and Kuwait, both dating back to before he was born—and he did not manage them well.

He signed a treaty with Iran in 1975 settling the dispute over the Iraq-Iran border, but it unravelled after the Shah was overthrown in 1978, and the new Islamic government of Ayatollah Khomeini began inciting the majority of Iraqi Arabs who share Iran's Shia religious heritage to throw off Saddam's godless socialist rule. In the great blunder of his life, Saddam went to war with Iran in 1980. Iranians outnumber Iraqis three-to-one, and without huge amounts of U.S. aid and those chemical weapons we keep hearing about (which the Reagan administration knew all about), he would not have survived.

Iraq emerged from that war in 1988 with hundreds of thousands dead, the welfare state in ruins—and \$60 billion in debt to its Gulf Arab neighbours. Saddam asked them to cancel the debt, since Iraq's sacrifices had "saved" them from revolutionary Iran. When they refused, he invaded Kuwait (which all the rulers of independent Iraq have claimed as part of Iraq) in August 1990. He thought he had cleared this with his American allies, but neither party understood what the other was saying in his famous conversation with the U.S. ambassador in Baghdad.

When Saddam Hussein contacted U.S. President George W. Bush four days after the invasion and offered the U.S. unlimited Kuwaiti oil at one-third of world market price in return for a deal on Kuwaiti sovereignty, Bush Senior coldly ordered him out of Kuwait. He refused, the Gulf War followed, and he has been under UN sanctions ever since, clinging to power in the ruins of the country he once raised to prosperity. He has been a disaster for Iraq, but he is not the new Hitler. He is not even a visceral anti-American, though U.S.-Iraqi relations have been bitterly hostile since 1990.

So, the right questions are: is Saddam likely to give chemical or biological weapons to the Islamist terrorists he loathes this month or next, when he has not done so in the past 20 years? If not, why do we need a war with Iraq now that will kill a great many people with old-fashioned high explosives?

INTRODUCTION OF THE COLORADO NORTHERN FRONT RANGE MOUNTAIN BACKDROP PROTECTION STUDY ACT

HON. MARK UDALL

OF COLORADO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, February 12, 2003

Mr. UDALL of Colorado. Mr. Speaker, today I am again introducing the Colorado Northern Front Range Mountain Backdrop Protection Study Act. I introduced a similar bill in the 107th Congress.

The bill is intended to help local communities identify ways to protect the Front Range Mountain Backdrop in the northern sections of the Denver-metro area, especially the region just west of the Rocky Flats Environmental Technology site. The Arapaho-Roosevelt National Forest includes much of the land in this backdrop area, but there are other lands involved as well.

Rising dramatically from the Great Plains, the Front Range of the Rocky Mountains provides a scenic mountain backdrop to many communities in the Denver metropolitan area and elsewhere in Colorado. The portion of the range within and adjacent to the Arapaho-Roosevelt National Forest also includes a diverse array of wildlife habitats and provides many opportunities for outdoor recreation.

The open-space character of this mountain backdrop is an important esthetic and economic asset for adjoining communities, making them attractive locations for homes and businesses. But rapid population growth in the northern Front Range area of Colorado is increasing recreational use of the Arapaho-Roosevelt National Forest and is also placing increased pressure for development of other lands within and adjacent to that national forest.

We can see this throughout Colorado and especially along the Front Range. Homes and shopping centers are sprawling up valleys and along highways that feed into the Front Range. This development then spreads out along the ridges and mountain tops that make up the backdrop. We are in danger of losing to development many of the qualities that have helped attract new residents. So, it is important to better understand what steps might be taken to avoid or lessen that risk—and this bill is designed to help us do just that.

Already, local governments and other entities have provided important protection for portions of this mountain backdrop, especially in the northern Denver-metro area. However, some portions of the backdrop in this part of Colorado remain unprotected and are at risk of losing their open-space qualities. This bill acknowledges the good work of the local communities to preserve open spaces along the backdrop and aims to assist further efforts along the same lines.

The bill does not interfere with the authority of local authorities regarding land use planning. It also does not infringe on private property rights. Instead, it will bring the land protection experience of the Forest Service to the table to assist local efforts to protect areas that comprise the backdrop. The bill envisions that to the extent the Forest Service should be involved with federal lands, it will work in collaboration with local communities, the state and private parties.